

Attorney Docket No. P70555US0
Application No. 10/532,348

Remarks/Arguments:

Claims 1 and 2 are pending.

Claims 1 and 2 are amended, hereby, merely to better effect formalities in accordance with PTO Rules. The amended claims define the identical subject matter defined in the original claims.

Present claims 1 and 2 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by GB 2360845 ("Ghoos"). Reconsideration is requested.

For anticipation under § 102 to exist, each and every claim limitation, as arranged in the claim, must be found in a single prior art reference. *Jamesbury Corp. v. Litton Industrial Products, Inc.*, 225 USPQ 253 (Fed. Cir. 1985). The "absence" from a prior art reference of a single claim limitation "negates anticipation." *Kolster Speedsteel A B v. Crucible Inc.*, 230 USPQ 81, 84 (Fed. Cir. 1986). A reference that discloses "substantially the same invention" is not an anticipation. *Jamesbury Corp.* To anticipate the claim, each claim limitation must "identically appear" in the reference disclosure. *Gechter v. Davidson*, 43 USPQ2d 1030, 1032 (Fed. Cir. 1997) (*emphasis added*). To be novelty defeating, a reference must put the public in possession of the identical invention claimed. *In re Donahue*, 226 USPQ 619 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

The presently claimed invention provides a "method for determining . . . gastric emptying," limited to, *i.a.*, "wherein body-related conversion factors are dispensed with." According to the statement of rejection, Ghoos fully meets all limitations on the rejected claims, including the limitation "where body-related conversion factors are dispensed with" (Office Action, page 2, last two lines). With all due respect, the statement of rejection is mistaken.

Attorney Docket No. P70555US0
Application No. 10/532,348

Ghoos discloses a method for measuring gastric emptying, as alleged in the statement of rejection. However, contrary to the statement of rejection, the (negative) limitation on the present claims "wherein body-related conversion factors are dispensed with" is absent from the teachings of the cited reference.

As taught by Ghoos (page 6, paragraph immediately following heading "*Analysis of the tubes*") (emphasis added):

^{13}C contents in breath is [sic] determined by on line gas chromatographic purification-isotope ratio mass spectrometry (ABCA: Europe Scientific). The δ value given by the isotope ratio mass spectrometry are [sic] converted to percentage ^{13}C recovery of the initial amount administered per hour (% dose $^{13}\text{C}/\text{h}$) according to the calculations described in detail by Ghoos et al (5)[.]

As such, measuring the amount of ^{13}C in air exhaled by the test subject is determined from a value " δ "—obtained by subjecting the exhaled air to isotope ratio mass spectrometry—which value is then "converted . . . according to calculations" using the % dose ^{13}C per hour administered to the body of the test subject.

In other words, body-related conversion—of the " δ " value obtained using isotope ratio mass spectrometry—to a percentage ^{13}C recovery value is taken into account, i.e., "body-related conversion factors" are not "dispensed with" in the Ghoos method (as opposed to the presently claimed method), allegations to the contrary in the statement of the rejection, notwithstanding.

The conversion is calculation employed by Ghoos was for the purpose of conforming the breath test (results) with "radioscintigraphy" (Ghoos, page 7, paragraph immediately following

Attorney Docket No. P70555US0
Application No. 10/532,348

heading "*In conclusion*"). *Radioscintigraphy* was considered to be "correct," i.e., to be the *gold standard*, as disclosed in the instant specification (pages 1 and 2).

To correlate radioscintigraphy with breath tests, body-related factors were used to calculate gastric half-emptying time and log phase. On the other hand, applicant discovered that the breath test—as presently claimed—is superior to radioscintigraphy; and, therefore, no body-related factors are be used to calculate the results.

Accordingly, the "absence" from Ghoos of the limitation "wherein body-related conversion factors are dispensed with" on the present claims "negates anticipation" of the present claims by the cited reference. *Kolster Speedsteel A B*, 230 USPQ at 84. To anticipate the claim, each claim limitation must "identically appear" in the reference disclosure. *Gechter*, 43 USPQ2d at 1032.

For the foregoing reasons, the rejection of present claims 1 and 2 under § 102 (b) as allegedly anticipated by Ghoos is overcome. Withdrawal of the rejection appears to be in order.

Attorney Docket No. P70555US0
Application No. 10/532,348

Favorable action is requested.

Respectfully submitted,



William E. Player
Reg. No. 31,409
Attorney of Record

JACOBSON HOLMAN PLLC

400 Seventh Street, NW

The Jenifer Building

Washington, D.C. 20004

Tel. (202) 638-6666

Fax (202) 393-5350

Date: January 2, 2009

WEP/aer

R:\WPLAYER\wep\&secretary\2009\January\P70555US0 - Amendment.wpd